

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, claims 6-8 stand objected to for informalities. Accordingly, these claims have all been amended herein to correct for the informalities noted by the Examiner, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection thereto are respectfully requested in light of these amendments.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for providing an insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the term “beginning scanning.” Applicants traverse this rejection because such minor informalities should not warrant a substantive rejection under Section 112, but instead only a claim objection. Nevertheless, the Examiner should see that the amendments to claim 8 herein have rendered this particular rejection moot.

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Both of these claims, have been amended herein to improve the grammar recited therein, and Applicants submit that this Section 112 has also been rendered moot by these clarifying amendments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are therefore also respectfully requested with respect to this rejection.

Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S. 2002/0179576). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a data scanning unit that performs both of a first-half data scanning and a second-half data scanning each a plurality of

times within each predetermined period of the liquid crystal display device, as in independent claims 1 and 8 of the present invention, as amended.

As cited in the rejection, Tanaka describes performing two data scanings only (a first-half write scanning and a second-half erase scanning) in each of the illustrated sub-frame periods. (See Fig. 4A-C, write period Ta, erase period Tc). Tanaka fails, however, to teach (or suggest) in the cited portions that data scanning is performed a plurality of times for each half scanning, namely, at least four times within a given predetermined period, such as a sub-frame period.

Independent claims 1 and 8, on the other hand, have been amended to clarify that both of the first-half and second-half scanings are each performed a plurality of times in each predetermined period. The Examiner can find support for this clarification in at least Fig. 10 of the present Application, and its accompanying text. Fig. 10 clearly illustrates at least two first-half scanings and at least two second-half scanings performed within each sub-frame period. The Examiner can further see that this embodiment is different from the embodiment shown in Fig. 9 of the present Application, where only one of each half scanning is illustrated to be performed in a given sub-frame. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the outstanding rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 based on Tanaka has been overcome at least in light of the amendments made to the claims herein.

The rejection of claims 2, 5, and 9-14 are therefore traversed for at least the reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8. All of

these individual claims depend directly from one of claims 1 and 8, and therefore include all of the features of their respective base claim, plus additional features.

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Yoshihara et al. (U.S. 2002/0000960). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection of independent claim 1. Both of claims 3-4 directly depend from independent claim 1, and therefore both of these claims should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection of claim 1 based on Tanaka alone.

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Nitto et al. (U.S. 2003/0123258). Applicants also traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above. Claims 6-7 both depend indirectly from independent claim 1.

For all of the forgoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-14, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Customer No. 24978

May 16, 2007


300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\1100\69785\BJ8714.DOC

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By:


Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954